

Remarks

Applicants thank the Examiner for his careful consideration of this application and for the very well-written Office Action of January 25, 2005. Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested in view of the amendments above and the remarks below.

Upon entry of the above amendments, Claims 1-38 remain pending in this application, with Claims 1, 29, 31, and 35 being independent claims.

Applicants acknowledge with gratitude the indication of allowable subject matter in Claims 4-21 and 28-34, as discussed at Page 15 of the Office Action.

At Page 2, the Office Action objects to the specification due to a typographical error in paragraph [0034]. Applicants have corrected this error by amending paragraph [0034] and now request withdrawal of the objection.

At Page 3, the Office Action rejects Claim 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In response, Applicants have amended Claim 28 using language similar to that suggested in the Office Action. Applicants have also submitted similar amendments to Claims 26 and 27.

At Pages 3-7 of the Office Action, Claims 1-3, 22, 23, 26, and 27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the article by Chun et al. At Pages 7-14 of the Office Action, Claims 1, 22-25, and 35-38 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by the article by Antani et al. These rejections are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

The invention as claimed in Claim 1 is directed to a method of extracting overlays from video. The method includes steps of detecting at least one potential overlay and verifying that the at least one potential overlay is an actual overlay. It is respectfully submitted that neither Chun et al. nor Antani et al. contains these steps.

In particular, both Chun et al. and Antani et al. are directed to methods for detecting text in video. However, Applicants note that neither one of these discriminates between text that is overlaid on the video and text that is part of the video, for example, a sign that appears in a video scene. The algorithms in both of these algorithms would recognize the words on the sign as being text, while Applicants' method would reject this as not being an overlay.

Consistent with this, neither Chun et al. nor Antani et al. is directed to detecting a potential overlay, and **neither reference verifies that a potential overlay is an actual overlay** (otherwise, text that is part of the scene would be differentiated from overlay text).

Claim 35 contains, among other recitations, limitations similar to those of Claim 1. All of the other rejected claims (Claims 2, 3, 22-27, and 36-38) depend from either Claim 1 or Claim 35. For at least the reasons cited above, it is respectfully submitted that all of these claims are allowable over the cited prior art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections and an indication of the allowance of their claims.


Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 17, 2005



Jeffrey W. Gluck, Ph.D.
Registration No. 44,457
VENABLE LLP
P.O. Box 34385
Washington, D.C. 20043-9998
Telephone: (202) 344-4000
Direct Dial: (202) 344-8017
Facsimile: (202) 344-8300